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Disclaimer

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the various authors of the publication and are not necessarily those of the Management of the African Development Bank (the “Bank”) and the African Development Fund (the “Fund”), Boards of Directors, Boards of Governors or the countries they represent. Use of this publication is at the reader’s sole risk. The content of this publication is provided without warranty of any kind, either express or implied, including without limitation warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, and non-infringement of third-party rights. The Bank specifically does not make any warranties or representations as to the accuracy, completeness, reliability or current validity of any information contained in the publication. Under no circumstances including, but not limited to, negligence, shall the Bank be liable for any loss, damage, liability or expense incurred or suffered which is claimed to result directly or indirectly from use of this publication or reliance on its content. This publication may contain advice, opinions, and statements of various information and content providers. The Bank does not represent or endorse the accuracy, completeness, reliability or current validity of any advice, opinion, statement or other information provided by any information or content provider or other person or entity. Reliance upon any such opinion, advice, statement, or other information shall also be at the reader’s own risk.

About the AfDB

The overarching objective of the African Development Bank Group is to spur sustainable economic development and social progress in its regional member countries (RMCs), thus contributing to poverty reduction. The Bank Group achieves this objective by mobilizing and allocating resources for investment in RMCs and providing policy advice and technical assistance to support development efforts.

About Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV)

The mission of Independent Development Evaluation at the AfDB is to enhance development effectiveness through independent and instrumental evaluations and partnerships for sharing knowledge.

Contact

Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV)
African Development Bank Group
Avenue Joseph Anoma, 01 BP 1387,
Abidjan 01 Côte d’Ivoire
Phone: +225 20 26 20 41
E-mail: idevhelpdesk@afdb.org
idev.afdb.org
About IDEV

IDEV carries out independent evaluations of AfDB operations, policies, strategies and corporate functions, working across projects, sectors, themes, regions, and countries.

By conducting independent evaluations and proactively sharing good practice, IDEV ensures that the AfDB and its stakeholders learn from past experience and plan and deliver development activities to the highest possible standards.

Mr. Patrick Zimpita
Executive Director representing Malawi, Botswana, Mauritius, Zambia.

“Independent Development Evaluation reports and knowledge products are like navigation instruments for the Bank, measuring the trajectory of the Bank’s investment and impact, with an objective of providing well researched independent information for the Board and Management to make informed investment decisions.”
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Improve the quality of life for the people of Africa.
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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>African Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APNODE</td>
<td>African Parliamentarians’ Network on Development Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBFF</td>
<td>Congo Basin Forest Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>Country Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDR</td>
<td>Comprehensive Evaluation of the Bank’s Development Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR-AA</td>
<td>Centers for Learning and Evaluation Results-Anglophone Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>Committee on Operations and Development Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COWSOs</td>
<td>Community-Owned Water Supply Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Country Strategy Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPE</td>
<td>Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBDM</td>
<td>Development and Business Delivery Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRE</td>
<td>AfDB Development Research Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPRADI</td>
<td>Evaluation Platform for Regional African Development Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEV</td>
<td>Independent Development Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARS</td>
<td>Management Action Record System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>Mid Term Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORAD</td>
<td>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHD</td>
<td>AfDB Human Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>Project Completion Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Project Results Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>Private Sector Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAe</td>
<td>Quality at Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE</td>
<td>Regional Integration Strategy Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISP</td>
<td>Regional Integration Strategy Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMC</td>
<td>Regional Member Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWSS/P</td>
<td>Rural Water Supply and Sanitation/Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNES</td>
<td>Strengthening National Evaluation Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Unit of Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 1 Unit Of Account = 1.36 USD, Feb. 2017
Message from the CODE Chair

Africa continues to suffer from the effects of the decline in commodity prices and subdued global growth, against the backdrop of declining international development assistance. This poses a challenge for addressing widening development gaps in the continent, which would threaten Africa’s chances of achieving the SDGs. As development practitioners, therefore, MDBs, including the African Development Bank (AfDB) must optimize the use of available scarce resources on the one part, and credibly evaluate the effectiveness of their initiatives on the other, so as to achieve the most impactful outcomes. The latter is what the independent development evaluation (IDEV) is doing in the AfDB context.

To enhance the implementation of its strategies and better support African countries to improve their socioeconomic outcomes, the AfDB has made significant strides in the last one year, including in the adoption of the Business Delivery and Development Model (DBDM) for the achievement of the High 5s. We believe that, if well implemented, they could transform the fortunes of Africa. This is where the role of IDEV becomes crucial – in measuring and evaluating progress in the implementation of the High 5s – from the viewpoint of effectiveness. If you don’t measure what you are doing, you can’t know how well you are doing and almost certainly will miss out on opportunities to learn from your mistakes. It would be tantamount to flying blind. IDEV’s work will thus be critical in achieving the High 5s! Indeed, the Board of Directors and CODE will continue to depend on IDEV’s evaluations and, working with Management, continue to evolve a more efficient and effective AfDB.
If the AfDB is to remain an effective player in the development of the continent, we must have a credible and constantly evolving way to measure our work with respect to delivery of intended objectives in a cost-effective manner. In this 2016 Report, IDEV has produced an assessment of the AfDB's programs across regional member countries and sectors, with a keen eye on relevance, delivery efficiency, sustainability and effectiveness. This Report summarizes the findings of evaluations conducted by IDEV in the last year, and presents a frank and well-rounded assessment of the AfDB's progress in order to draw lessons from successes and learning points.

**LOOKING AHEAD**

As the Bank proceeds with the implementation of its High 5s, IDEV's insight will continue to be indispensable. The Bank’s independent evaluations will not only be backward looking, but also provide important guideposts for improved project design and implementation, effective country dialogue, and overall development impact.

I am pleased to note the extensive consultations carried out by IDEV with Management and the Board in its work program. CODE and, indeed, the Board of the AfDB, stands ready to continue supporting IDEV. I commend this valuable Report to Stakeholders.

**Dr. Bright Okogu,**  
Chairman, CODE

“... the role of IDEV becomes crucial – in measuring and evaluating progress in the implementation of the High 5s – from the viewpoint of effectiveness. If you don’t measure what you are doing, you can’t know how well you are doing and almost certainly will miss out on opportunities to learn from your mistakes. It would be tantamount to flying blind. IDEV’s work will thus be critical in achieving the High 5s! ...”
I am delighted to provide this foreword for the IDEV 2016 Annual Report. 2016 was a historic year for the Bank. In addition to record lending and disbursements, we were able to approve four of the High 5 Strategies and put them on the track for implementation. We increased our speed by decreasing the lapse of time for the procurement of goods and services as well as the lapse of time between approval and loan effectiveness. All these are tangible results of the Bank’s transformation, which are aimed at making the bank more responsive to the development needs of its member countries, more nimble, move it closer to its clients, improve its effectiveness and increase its development impact and revenues.

Impact, relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency are key principles that will guide the Bank’s transformation, and are therefore closely linked with IDEV’s mandate. IDEV was able to deliver 13 evaluations, including 2 impact evaluations, and particularly the Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results (CEDR), which covered 14 countries (including middle income, low income and transition countries), representing over 60% of the Bank’s operations between 2004 and 2014.

The Bank’s High 5 priorities, notably Light Up and power Africa, Feed Africa, Industrialize Africa, Integrate Africa and Improve the Quality of life for the people of Africa, have very ambitious financing needs and would require the Bank to develop innovative financing mechanisms, including syndication, co-financing, and balance sheet leveraging. This follows from the Addis Ababa Conference on Financing for Development in 2015 which advocated
for Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) to significantly increase their financing to developing countries.

The global economy is going through some uncertain times, with the increase in protectionism and anti-multilateralism, significant dips in the prices of commodities, the economic slowdown in China, and the rise in insurgency movements, amongst others. These geo-political risks have resulted in the dearth of financial resources, even though the financing needs of developing countries, particularly African countries, have been rising.

With the scarcity of financial capital, the need for selectivity of the Bank’s operations in order to deliver the highest development impact cannot be overemphasized. Indeed selection of the High 5s was an effort aimed at being more focused, sharper, and selective. Selectivity is one of the key recommendations from the evaluations that IDEV completed in 2016. And therefore, IDEV is an important stakeholder in enabling the Bank improve its development efficiency and effectiveness.

**Dr. Frannie Leautier,**
*Senior Vice President*
I am deeply honored and pleased to present the 2016 Annual Report of the Independent Development Evaluation function (IDEV) of the African Development Bank Group (AfDB). In 2016, we built on the momentum gathered over the previous years, delivering 13 high level evaluations that included two impact evaluations. Once again, this is the greatest number of evaluations that IDEV has completed in its 30-year history. It is indeed a matter of great pride for me that the IDEV team continues to deliver higher numbers of evaluations that are also of improved quality year after year. In addition to exceeding its yearly target number of high-level evaluations, IDEV successfully organized and actively participated in several knowledge events, dialogue forums, and evaluation capacity development initiatives.

"We live in uncertain times" goes the expression. Political winds and the winds of climate change both confirmed that the only certain thing in these unusual times is change itself. This was true not just for global shifts but also for shifts in the immediate environment; the Bank launched its strategic priorities under the High 5s and its new development and business delivery model. While this may not be the moment to evoke Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle, it is certainly the right time to recall Darwin’s views on adaptability – not merely to survive but to make a difference. IDEV continued to anticipate, adapt, and align itself by remaining agile and nimble, pushing forward in its quest for greater development effectiveness.

The crown jewel of IDEV’s work in 2016 was the Comprehensive Evaluation of the Bank’s Development Results (CEDR). It was the most ambitious evaluation ever and the first of such scale in Bank history. The CEDR was predominantly informed by 14 country strategy evaluations – seven of which were delivered in 2016 – and 169 individual project results assessments.

For the first time in our history, we utilized the new tool of impact evaluations, evaluating two rural water and sanitation programs, one in Ethiopia and the other in Tanzania. The challenge was to create comparison groups ex-post that were similar to
those that had benefited, since this had not been planned during the design phase. The delivery of these impact evaluations fulfilled an earlier commitment to initiate an evaluation of the impact of the Bank’s development initiatives.

IDEV’s engagement in the complex, ever-shifting world of knowledge management continues to grow. We launched and participated in several knowledge-sharing and outreach events in our ongoing efforts to enhance the conduct and use of evaluations. Key among these were the AfDB Development Evaluation Week that we hosted in Abidjan and which was attended by over 250 participants, and a joint seminar on private sector assistance in Oslo with Norad, at which the Private Sector Development Evaluation synthesis was presented to more than 100 stakeholders -- policy makers, private sector, academia, civil society, media and local African diplomatic missions.

We continued our efforts to boost the evaluation capacity of regional member countries through the African Parliamentarians’ Network on Development Evaluation, the Evaluation Platform for Regional African Development Institutions, and the Strengthening National Evaluation Systems initiative.

As we consider the challenges of 2017, I wish to express my deep gratitude to the AfDB Board of Directors for its continued oversight and guidance. Thanks to your support, the influence of evaluation continues to grow within the Bank. The approval of the revised independent evaluation policy is a big step forward in further strengthening the authorizing environment while providing greater clarity about roles and responsibilities. Management is paying greater attention to the evaluations and striving to learn lessons and incorporate them into future initiatives. More importantly, it is also demanding evaluations.

I would also like to thank all IDEV staff. Your dedication and hard work enable us to deliver on our commitments. It was an unusual year, to say the least, with unusual pressures and timelines. I am keenly aware of the extra long hours that the IDEV team devoted to completing complex tasks in a timely manner. I am also aware of the sacrifices that the team made as a result of being short-staffed, something that we hope to address shortly. The depth of pride I feel in looking back at the team’s performance is immense. Growing determination, industry, teamwork, and leadership are visible at every level. While this may not be evident to the outside world, it is crystal clear to me. This is precisely what gives me confidence that the team will continue to deliver in the years ahead – no matter how unusual they may be. Ours is an unusual team. And it is critical for ensuring that we deliver for Africa and for all Africans who need us more than ever before in these uncertain times.

Mr. Rakesh Nangia,
Evaluator General
IDEV over the year

February

Evaluation Community of Practice event
How well has the World Bank focused its support on poverty reduction over the past decade?

March

Evaluation
Publication eVALUation Matters Q1
Is the AfDB Delivering on its Commitments?
Evaluation Capacity Development for Staff
Training on Presenting Data Effectively
Training on Designing, Managing and Undertaking Impact Evaluations

May

Evaluation
Evaluation Community of Practice Event
Joint IDEV/Independent Evaluation Group World Bank Learning Event on Engagement in Resource-Rich Countries
External Knowledge Event
AfDB Annual Meeting – Seminar on the Transition to Green Growth
Evaluation Capacity Development for RMCs
APNODE Executive Committee Meeting
Evaluation Capacity Development for Staff
Training on Integral Approach to Impact Evaluation
June

**Publication eVALUation Matters Q2**
Evaluation of Private Sector Development Assistance

**Evaluations**

**Evaluation Capacity Development for Staff**
Bank-wide event on Impact Evaluation held in collaboration with EDRE and OSHD

July

**Evaluations**

**Evaluation Capacity Development for RMCs**
APNODE Annual General Meeting

August

**Evaluations**

**External Knowledge Event**
Asian Evaluation Week

**Publication eVALUation Matters Q3**
Value for Money in Development Work

**Revised Independent Evaluation Policy**
**October**

**Evaluations**
- Evaluation Synthesis on Private Sector Development

**External Knowledge Event**
- Presentation of the Private Sector Synthesis Report in Oslo

**November**

**Development Evaluation Week**
- Driving Africa’s Transformation: Good Practices and Strategies for Development Practitioners

**Evaluation Capacity Development for RMCs**
- EPRADI Face-to-Face meeting
- APNODE Executive Committee meeting

**Presentation of the CEDR**
- at the 3rd replenishment meeting of ADF-14 in Luxembourg

**Evaluation Capacity Development for staff**
- Workshop on Impact Evaluation for Quality and Inclusive Development Effectiveness at Development Evaluation Week

**Knowledge Café on Evaluation Utilization**

**December**

**Evaluations**
- Mozambique CEDR Case Study (2004-2013)

**Update of the iDEV 2016-2018 Work Program**

**Evaluation Capacity Development for staff**
- Atlas.ti Software Training

**Publication eVALUation Matters Q4**
- Evaluation Week Special edition
Light up and power Africa.
David Muthia Mwangi, Freelancer, Kenya. Evaluation Week Photo contest – 3rd Prize winner
The world of international development is changing…

2016 was a year of dynamic change in the landscape of the international development world, especially with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by the end of 2015. The Millennium Development Goals evolved to interdependent, mutually-reinforcing SDGs. While the former goals focused mainly on areas such as poverty and health in developing countries, the SDGs are universal, all-inclusive, and with a broader remit that includes the environment, human rights, partnership, equity and gender equality. Although Africa’s economic performance continued to outperform the global economic performance, as the second-fastest-growing region, the sources of development financing were in decline and calls for greater scrutiny of public spending were more critical in the international political debate. This came against the backdrop of the United Kingdom’s vote to leave the European Union, a more populist tone in other European countries, and a new government in the United States. Even as it grows increasingly relevant and useful, development evaluation must respond to the changing circumstances and growing demand for new forms of evaluation that are cross-sectoral, more complex, and involve many more players than ever before.

… and so is the African Development Bank

Guided by its new development and business delivery model (DBDM) the Bank embarked on a transformation process that aims to boost it to better deliver on the High 5s. The changes included an important restructuring, moving operations closer to clients in the Regional Member Countries (RMCs), and devolving decision-making to the regional hubs. The DBDM seeks to inculcate a culture of performance, delivery and institutional learning that improves and evolves.

In this dynamic environment, business as usual cannot be the response

IDEV ensures that its products and services in any given year address the Bank’s priorities and challenges. The independent evaluation policy that was approved in 2016 recognized that the evaluation function is more relevant than ever for providing lessons and advice to shape the future direction of the Bank. IDEV thus endeavored to become more flexible, adapting and positioning itself to be an actor of change while transforming to best support that change. It strived to deliver products and services that were more responsive to enhancing the institutional effectiveness of the AfDB. Hence IDEV sustained its competency, delivering timely, high quality, useful evaluative knowledge. But it was not business as usual at IDEV in 2016.

---

3 The High 5s are the five priority action areas for the AfDB: Light up and power Africa; Feed Africa; Industrialize Africa; Integrate Africa, and Improve the quality of life for the people of Africa.
4 For Independent Evaluation Policy, see http://idev.afdb.org/en/document/revised-independent-evaluation-policy
In 2016, IDEV exceeded its yearly targets. It completed 11 high-level evaluations, including a corporate evaluation, the Comprehensive Evaluation of the Bank’s Development Results (CEDR), seven country strategy and program evaluations (CSPEs), a country program case study, a regional integration strategy evaluation (RISE) for Eastern Africa, and an evaluation synthesis on Private Sector Development (PSD). It also completed two impact evaluations of country rural water and sanitation programs.

19-25
IDEV adapted to the changing context …

26-33
More than adaptation, IDEV has positioned itself as a driver of change

34-37
IDEV is transforming to best support change

### NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL BUDGET (UA million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDEV adapted to the changing context...

... by conducting evaluations to improve the Bank’s performance...

The CEDR stands out among the evaluations delivered in 2016. It was a major assignment with the potential to shape current and future strategies, programs, policies, and the Bank’s overall direction. Its aim was threefold: to provide a credible assessment of development results attained by Bank assistance to its RMCs during the period 2004-2013, to provide a basis for accounting for Bank investment, and to draw pertinent lessons to inform the design and implementation of future interventions. The CEDR was the most complex evaluation that IDEV had ever undertaken. The results were presented to the Bank’s Committee on Operations and Development Effectiveness and at the third replenishment meeting of ADF-14 in Luxembourg.

The CEDR was designed as a synthesis of country-level evaluation studies conducted in 14 countries – Burundi, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, and Zambia. The selection of countries, which broadly matched the composition of the Bank’s portfolio in terms of regional balance, language, fragility and eligibility for the various financing windows, represented almost 60% of the Bank’s lending portfolio based on approvals during the review period.

**Findings:** Overall, the evaluation found that the Bank Group delivered modest development results and changed lives: more than half (64%) of the Bank-financed projects led to or were likely to lead to positive benefits for the target beneficiaries. However, only close to 27% of the interventions examined did or were likely to achieve their planned outcomes; about 30% were expected to achieve less than half of their planned outcomes. The sustainability and efficiency of Bank interventions were also poor: 28% of Bank operations were found to have robust mechanisms in place for ensuring financial and economic viability and almost half the projects examined were delayed by a year or more. Still, the Bank had found niches where the right mix of dialogue, knowledge and

“... the comprehensive evaluation of the development results of the AfDB Group 2004-2013 was important for all of us in 2016, independent from it being the year of the ADF-14 replenishment.

It allowed us to look back at where the Bank is coming from and focused our attention on learning, outcomes and persistent deficiencies. Much has been strengthened in the meantime. However, my and other colleagues’ continuing comments in the Committee on the quality of result management frameworks, show that we are far from there and also need to better manage the flow of evaluation knowledge into operations...”
lending fostered good outcomes, for example in the area of public-private partnerships. In addition, it was widely appreciated as a development partner, notably in transition countries where long-standing relationships had built trust and allowed the Bank to act as an advisor. While Bank presence (in the form of an office) in a country helped, it has not always allowed the Bank to react to less favorable country conditions, by developing a clear understanding of implementation risks and constraints for example. Quality of design and of supervision were found to be the main factors that were negatively influencing Bank performance.

**Recommendations were made in three areas:** Positioning in context, improving corporate services, and enhancing delivery.

1. **Positioning in context.** The Bank pursues different objectives and faces different challenges depending on the RMC context. It needs to better analyze and clarify the strategic role it intends to play and pursue partnerships that are relevant to delivering the High 5s at country level. The Bank also needs to deepen its understanding of the constraints to implementation and to the sustainability of its interventions. Together with defining clear roles and possible partnerships, this should form the basis for framing strategies, programs, and projects around key selected outcomes. Finally, the Bank should ensure that its country offices are adequately resourced so that they can ably implement its strategies in the RMCs.

2. **Improving corporate services.** The Bank needs to ensure that its corporate strategies are based on a well-designed theory of change that is shared with stakeholders and partners, and that its corporate procedures are flexible enough to quickly respond to country-specific needs. Whenever it can fill knowledge gaps in areas related to its strategies, the Bank should be in a position to propose a relevant combination of analytical work, dialogue, and financing instruments to the client country.

3. **Enhancing delivery.** The Bank needs to strengthen its performance and accountability frameworks, processes, and culture. Closer attention should be paid to the depth and quality of supervision for both public and private sector operations.

---

**CEDR methodology and process**

The CEDR was three years in the making and involved almost all IDEV staff. IDEV’s 2013-2015 work program was amended to prioritize the building blocks of the CEDR as well as to mobilize additional resources. The CEDR used mixed methods including qualitative comparative analysis. It had standardized guidelines for project level results assessments, and country strategy and program evaluations. To ensure robustness, the CEDR relied on a strong quality assurance process that included internal and external peer reviews of all building blocks. Further, a panel of senior advisors comprised of renowned development evaluation experts scrutinized the CEDR process and final synthesis. Their independent statement was included in the final CEDR report: “In the initial meeting we expressed doubt about the feasibility of completing the task within the prescribed timeline given the major logistical and conceptual challenges involved. Indeed we judged the remit of the evaluation a ‘mission impossible’. As things turned out the process was five months longer than planned and a substantive part of IDEV’s work program for 2014 and 2015 was refocused to feed into the CEDR. We nevertheless give the evaluation team credit for delivering credible answers to strategic questions raised in line with CODE’s request.” The delivery of the CEDR was the most significant achievement of 2016.

The CEDR process

Building blocks

- Country performance case studies
- 14 Contextual Factor Reviews
- Project level assessments
- 169 Project Results Assessments

Rigorous Quality Assurance

Synthesis

- Qualitative Comparative Analysis Portfolio review
- 10 past evaluation studies

CEDR Synthesis Report
... by being responsive to demand ...

The Bank’s transformation demands required changes to several of its operations, policies, strategies, and programs. They also increased the need for additional evaluations to inform decision making. IDEV complied swiftly with several requests for such evaluations in 2016. At the request of the Eastern Africa regional directorate, IDEV undertook an evaluation of the Eastern Africa RISP in record time. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which development results were achieved in the context of the strategy (period 2011-2015), and to identify lessons that will inform the preparation of the new regional integration strategy paper. Within four months of the request, IDEV delivered this important evaluation, examining 24 regional operations that had received Bank funds amounting to UA 1.41 billion. It accomplished this by making extra efforts and stretching its resources.

For the full report see http://idev.afdb.org/en/page/recent-evaluations

Subsequently, Bank Management requested that IDEV undertake an evaluation of the Central Africa RISP (2011-2015), which had not been foreseen in its 2016-2018 work program. This evaluation is currently ongoing and seeks to understand the extent to which the introduction of the regional integration strategy made a difference and to identify lessons to inform the next strategy for the Central Africa region.

Key messages from the Eastern Africa RISE

- Bank operations made good progress towards achieving results related to regional integration, but concerns remain about the sustainability of its strategic outcomes.
- Capacity issues, particularly in regional economic communities, hampered effectiveness and sustainability.
- The vital role of regional economic communities as building blocks for continental integration could be stressed by strategically investing Bank resources in their institutional strengthening.
- Major weaknesses were noted in efficiency (timeliness, procurements) and results-based management (disconnect between outputs and outcomes).
- Adequate and well-resourced monitoring and evaluation systems are required.

At the request of the governing board, IDEV also began an independent evaluation of the Congo Basin Forest Fund (CBFF), similarly unforeseen in its 2016-18 Work Program. The CBFF was established in 2008, is administered by the Bank, and is set to finish in 2018. Its crucial evaluation is expected to be delivered in May 2017, and will inform the Bank’s future direction for this initiative.
As part of IDEV’s continued effort to build African capacity to carry out evaluations and to increase demand for their use, IDEV stepped up its support to evaluation initiatives in Africa.

Since its creation in 2014, the African Parliamentarians’ Network on Development Evaluation (APNODE) has set a great milestone. Membership has expanded from the initial 7 countries to 20. A Constitution and Strategic Plan have been adopted and the elected executive committee meets regularly. More than 100 parliamentarians across Africa were trained on development evaluation concepts and application strategies. The APNODE website keeps members and other interested stakeholders informed of developments.

IDEV extended its support to the Evaluation Platform for Regional African Development Institutions,\(^5\) resulting in an agreement on activities and a budget for 2017. During the meeting organized by IDEV in Abidjan, the seven sub-regional development institutions reaffirmed their commitment to harmonize evaluation methods and practices and designated the Development Bank of Southern Africa as the lead organization for 2017.

---

\(^5\) The seven founding members are the Eastern and Southern African Trade and Development Bank (formerly known as PTA Bank); Banque d’Investissement et de Développement de la Communauté Economique Des Etats de l’Afrique de l’Ouest; Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD); Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa; Commission de l’Union Economique et Monétaire Ouest Africaine; Development Bank of Southern Africa, and the East African Community. IDEV is a permanent observer.
Madam Niale Kabba, Minister of Planning and Development, Cote d’Ivoire, delivered a keynote address at the Development Evaluation Week.
IDEV remains committed to strengthening evaluation systems in RMCs to promote an evaluation culture. At the request of the Ethiopian authorities, IDEV delivered a regional diagnostic study to inform the formulation of the national monitoring and evaluation policy of the Government of Ethiopia.

In 2016, IDEV stepped up efforts to enhance evaluation capacity by organizing eight learning activities for IDEV staff and the evaluation community in the Bank, with a particular emphasis on impact evaluation skills and awareness. Fifty participants, including RMC officials, attended a practical training by the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) on the design and management of impact evaluations. Subsequently the integral approach to impact evaluation was presented by the Catholic University of America during a four-day training. Together with the Bank’s Development Research Department and Social and Human Development Department, IDEV organized a Bank-wide sensitization event on impact evaluation. On the first day of the Development Evaluation Week, IDEV hosted a workshop aimed at raising awareness of the value of impact evaluation for enhancing development effectiveness. IDEV staff also participated in two other trainings, one on presenting data effectively and the other on the use of Atlas.ti software for qualitative research and analysis. Finally, colleagues from the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank joined two sessions of the Bank’s Evaluation Community of Practice to discuss “How well has the World Bank focused its support on poverty reduction over the past decade?” and engagement in resource-rich countries.
IDEV has positioned itself as a driver of change...

... maintaining exceptional quality, timely and useful deliveries ...

In 2016, IDEV delivered seven country strategy and program evaluations (CSPE) and one country program case study, covering a total portfolio of UA 14.6 billion, more than it has ever delivered in a single year during its 30 years of existence. The CSPEs were undertaken in a timely manner to serve as building blocks of the CEDR and to inform the design of the new country strategy papers. As part of the CSPE processes during the CEDR, IDEV introduced two innovative tools that enhanced the quality of its CSPEs: the contextual factor review (CFR), and the project results assessment (PRA). The CFRs sharpened the assessment of contextual factors (internal, drivers of performance, and external, country conditions) that influence the achievement of results by the Bank. The PRA improved the quality and consistency of project level assessments in CSPEs.

Combined findings from the seven CSPEs

The evaluation findings were defined using four criteria: relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and efficiency. Each CSPE is rated against these criteria as illustrated in the CSPE Ratings table.

**Relevance** measures the extent to which the Bank’s strategy and program in a country are aligned with the priorities of the country, the needs of the targeted beneficiaries and with the Bank’s strategic priorities. CSPEs delivered in 2016 have found strategies and policies overall to be relevant.

**Effectiveness** measures the extent to which the Bank’s strategy and program in a country have achieved their intended results. CSPEs delivered in 2016 have shown mixed performance, which is usually higher in priority infrastructure

“*I am very pleased with the quality and usefulness of IDEV evaluations. Evaluation evidence is essential for learning about the AfDB’s progress and impact. Timely evaluations enable me to make informed decisions on everything from country strategy papers and the selection of financial instruments, to the likely sustainability of individual projects. Ultimately, I rely on robust, objective evaluation evidence for learning what works on the ground in Africa.”*
areas covered such as transport and power and more variable in other areas such as agriculture or access to finance.

**Efficiency** measures the extent to which resources are used in a way that maximizes outputs. CSPEs delivered in 2016 have found that implementation delays constitute a major limiting factor to the efficiency of the Bank’s interventions.

**Sustainability** measures the likelihood that development benefits achieved will continue after the conclusion of an intervention. CSPEs delivered in 2016 have found that the sustainability of outcomes remains an issue for the Bank’s interventions globally, despite some variability across sectors.
The portfolio includes all projects approved in the period and in some cases additional projects included for relevance reasons. Volumes presented are net loans, i.e. total approvals for the period from which cancelations are deducted.

The initially planned Mozambique CSPE was changed to a CEDR country case study due to resource constraints, although the evaluative analysis remained globally the same. The main purpose of the change was to remove the time constraint for presenting a full report ahead of the CSP pillars discussion at CODE, which would have been difficult to achieve with the available resources.

For full reports, see http://idev.afdb.org/en/page/recent-evaluations
IDEV also delivered the evaluation synthesis “Towards Private Sector Growth: Lessons from Experience”, which contributes to the global body of knowledge. In partnership with the evaluation department of Norad, IDEV undertook a synthesis of 33 private sector development (PSD) evaluation reports from bilateral and multilateral institutions conducted over the last five years. The main objective of the synthesis was to mine evaluative information to inform the strategic direction, design, and implementation of future PSD interventions. The synthesis drew lessons on what works, what does not, and why, so as to enhance the private sector’s role in spurring economic growth and development effectiveness in Africa.

Key messages from the PSD evaluation synthesis

**General consensus on the key constraints to PSD:** inadequate access to electricity, finance and infrastructure, corruption, tax hikes, political instability, competition from the informal sector, and weak worker and management skills.

**Given the modest volume of donor support to PSD compared to the significant needs of the private sector, the focus should be on transforming market structure or behavior.**

**PSD initiatives require country-specific and consultative diagnostics of the challenges, needs and absorptive capacity of the private and public sectors.**

**Donor support should include capacity development for intermediaries to enhance their institutional capacity and foster an environment for success.**

**Design, implement, and invest in rigorous monitoring and evaluation systems that focus on the outcomes of PSD initiatives.**

... and sharing knowledge and ideas

In keeping with its commitment to ensuring proactive dissemination of evaluative knowledge, IDEV hosted the AfDB Development Evaluation Week in Abidjan, its first such event since the Bank returned to Côte d’Ivoire. It was hugely successful, with more than 250 participants from Africa and beyond sharing ideas revolving around evaluation and the Bank’s High 5s.

IDEV also participated in three external events to disseminate evaluative knowledge: the Bank’s Annual Meetings in Zambia, the Asian Evaluation Week in China, and a seminar on Private Sector Assistance in Norway.

IDEV continued to roll out its various knowledge products and to manage resources intended to strengthen the dissemination of lessons from its evaluations. A total of 68 new products in English and French were added to IDEV’s catalogue of publications. These included evaluation reports, evaluation briefs, highlights and executive summaries, and the quarterly eVALUation Matters. For the first time, IDEV produced two podcasts and an animation.
Development Evaluation Week 2016: Driving Africa’s Transformation

Global leaders, prominent speakers, development experts and practitioners, and evaluators participated during a 4-day event in thought-provoking debates aimed at helping the AfDB achieve its strategic objective of driving Africa’s transformation through the High 5s. A mix of presentations, keynote speeches, panel discussions, and question-and-answer sessions with the audience encouraged all to share their views and knowledge, and to learn from each other.

Participants examined the High 5s’ core tenets, shared experiences, lessons, and innovative solutions and made enlightened recommendations. There was overall consensus that the partnership between the public and the private sectors should be deepened and enhanced and an effective multi-stakeholder engagement encouraged while ensuring that ownership be vested in African countries. Transforming Africa, it was agreed, can only be achieved by creating an enabling environment and strengthening regulatory frameworks. The forum also agreed that an integrated approach to development, focused on inclusiveness and impact and measured by efficient M&E systems, was essential.

Contestants from across Africa were invited to share their views and engage with the High 5s through essay, presentation, and photo contests.

For the full story, see eVALUation Matters Q4 and the IDEV website: http://idev.afdb.org/en/page/evaluation-week
AfDB and Norad shed light on private sector development actions

On October 24, IDEV and the Norad evaluation department co-hosted a seminar on private sector assistance in Oslo, Norway. The event was centered on the joint IDEV-Norad evaluation synthesis report, Towards Private Sector Led Growth: Lessons of Experience, highlighting the wealth of existing evaluation evidence from 33 evaluations of donor support for PSD.

Over 100 key stakeholders including Norwegian policy-makers, private sector, academia, civil society and the media were present. They highlighted the relevance of the mix of donor support instruments and how development partners would work together to ensure that the private sector creates shared growth and contributes to poverty reduction.

Several IDEV knowledge products were disseminated: the Private Equity Evaluation, SME Evaluation, and the PSD synthesis reports.


Furthermore, IDEV promoted its work and disseminated its products through social media, direct mail (electronic and physical), and the IDEV website http://idev.afdb.org, on which all IDEV evaluations and related resources and publications are available.

The use of two online platforms set up by IDEV to maximize the use of evaluation results picked up pace. Firstly, the Management Action Record System (MARS) which tracks the implementation of actions in response to recommendations from IDEV evaluations. With its rollout, IDEV, in collaboration with Bank management, fulfilled a longstanding obligation to the Board to introduce a mechanism that helps hold Management accountable for implementing evaluation recommendations. An overview of the progress in implementing management actions is provided in Annex 3. Secondly, the Evaluation Results Database, accessible from the IDEV website on http://evrd.afdb.org, and from the Bank’s Intranet, enables users to retrieve and analyze findings, recommendations, and lessons from evaluations of past projects, programs, policies and strategies.

Mr. Damoni Kitabire, Resident Representative – Zambia

“The Country Strategy 2002- 2015 Evaluation Report provided us a critical independent view on the Bank’s support to Zambia. It has confirmed that we are on the right track in terms of how we support Zambia’s development aspirations. It also reminds us that we need to do much more in terms of improving project efficiency when it comes to procurement and disbursements.”
**MARS**
- Evaluations: 34
- No. of recommendations: 319
- No. of actions: 448

**CONTACTS DATABASE**
- Contacts: 2,020

**TWITTER**
- Tweets: 586

**EVALUATION RESULTS DATABASE**
- Documents: 1,241
- Lessons: 2,692
- Recommendations: 4,524

**WEBSITE** (July-December 2016)
- Sessions: 11,442
- % of sessions accessed with desktop: 78.10%

**KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS**
- Produced in 2016: 68
- Disseminated by end of 2016: 8,000
IDEV is transforming to best support change

... expanding the choice of evaluation products ...

IDEV expanded its product range to include impact evaluations of the AfDB’s rural water supply and sanitation program (RWSSP), one in Ethiopia (2006-2014) and one in Tanzania (2006-2015). The evaluations assessed the net effects of the RWSSPs on the quality of life of the rural beneficiaries, mainly in terms of use of improved water, diarrhea incidence, the time spent fetching water and the likelihood that the benefits of the RWSSP would be sustained. Both evaluations drew lessons and gave recommendations for improving ongoing and future RWSSPs. Main findings:

» The Ethiopia RWSSP impact evaluation report advised the Bank to work hand in hand with the key stakeholders in Ethiopia (federal to local level) to develop a clear strategy for sustaining program benefits. Furthermore, the Bank should support the setup of an effective monitoring, evaluation and learning system to ensure regular program data collection, analysis, reporting and feedback.


» The Tanzania RWSSP impact evaluation recommended that the Bank support the government’s public-sector management reforms to ensure that such programs are well funded and managed, and linked to national sanitation campaigns.


... using new approaches ...

To add value to a changing Bank, IDEV diversified its work to take on more forms of evaluation intended to improve ongoing strategies, programs, policies and processes.

As part of its 2016 work program, IDEV launched a pilot mid-term evaluation of the Bank’s CSP in Namibia. The Bank’s CSP in Namibia covers the period 2014-2018. The aim of this evaluation is twofold: to generate knowledge and draw recommendations to improve the implementation of the ongoing strategy; and to propose lessons for consideration in the implementation of the remaining half of the program. As this is a pilot exercise, IDEV will also draw lessons from the evaluation to inform future mid-term evaluations.

IDEV also started the formative evaluation of the Bank’s human resource management policy and strategic directions to inform the formulation of a new human resource management strategy. This will be done by drawing lessons from the implementation of the Bank’s People Strategy 2013-2017, from the experience of other organizations including development finance institutions and private sector companies, and from good practice standards in strategic human resource management, while considering the Bank’s challenges and evolving
institutional environment. Implementation time will be very short (around 3 months) so as to be able to influence the on-going change process in the Bank.

... and restructuring the work program around the High 5s and the Bank's transformation.

With the introduction of the High 5s and the Bank’s new DBDM, which includes a new organizational structure and greater decentralization, IDEV’s role as provider of knowledge and lessons for learning gains greater importance. IDEV has taken further steps to align its major evaluations more closely with the Bank’s priorities by revising its 2016-2018 work program. The 2017 work program will include additional focus on the management and quality of the project lifecycle. Indeed, further to the presentation and discussion of the CEDR at the third replenishment meeting of ADF-14 in Luxembourg, ADF Deputies asked IDEV to present an evaluation of the quality of supervision at the ADF-14 mid-term review meeting. As the quality of supervision is critical for the effectiveness of Bank operations, this additional evaluation is scheduled to start in 2017 and will complement evaluations already planned on the Bank’s self-evaluation systems and on the quality at entry of operations. The evaluation of the integrated safeguards system was also brought forward from 2018 to further elucidate this important risk management tool.

As recent developments show that the Bank is increasingly using the budget support instrument, IDEV will advance an evaluation of policy based operations that had originally been planned for 2018.

The table shows the alignment of the high-level evaluations to begin in 2017 with the High 5s and the Bank’s transformation process.

Dr. Samy Zaghloul
Executive Director representing Egypt and Djibouti.

“... We look forward to more support from IDEV in order to ensure effectiveness, accountability, and soundness of the Bank’s strategies, policies, programs, and projects which will entail better work towards achieving its development objectives and putting the High 5s into action.”
Rural water supply and sanitation – an AfDB intervention that has changed the quality of life for many
Alignment of evaluations starting in 2017 to the High 5s and the Bank’s transformation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluations</th>
<th>HIGH 5s</th>
<th>Light up &amp; Power Africa</th>
<th>Feed Africa</th>
<th>Industrialize Africa</th>
<th>Integrate Africa</th>
<th>Improve the Quality of Life of the People of Africa</th>
<th>Bank Transformation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde CSPE</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius CSPE</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland CSPE</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda MTE</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-based</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank partnership:</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing,</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndication, and</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Self Evaluation</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems and Processes</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Supervision</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality at Entry of Public Sector Operations</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Safeguards and processes</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
<td>🌈</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges

As in previous years, IDEV faced challenges in 2016. Key among them were:

**Risk of Isolation.** The revised independent evaluation policy, approved by the Board in September 2016, strengthened IDEV’s independence. However, the pitfall of greater independence is a growing risk of isolation within the institution that increasingly delinks IDEV from the rest of the Bank and threatens the relevance and utility of its evaluations.

**Capacity.** IDEV has faced capacity constraints both in terms of staff numbers and the skills mix. Several open vacancies could not be filled for various reasons, leaving IDEV understaffed throughout 2016 and creating unsustainable pressure on staff. IDEV intends to do more evaluation work in-house and is committed to gradually reducing the use of external consultants. By strengthening its capacity in numbers and in skills over the coming years, IDEV hopes to achieve its objective in the medium term.

**Accessibility and quality of data.** In its 2015 annual report, IDEV mentioned the lack of reliable monitoring and especially of development results data. The situation did not improve in 2016. Within the Bank, access to data remains difficult largely because several different IT platforms are used to manipulate and store data, and these IT platforms are unable to work with each other. IDEV seeks reliable data wherever it can. Within the framework of the CEDR, IDEV made significant efforts to gather data, to use different sources, and to create its own dataset. Meant for the CEDR, this dataset may have limited use for other purposes however, such as a meta-analysis of project performance within the Bank and across MDBs.

"As the IDEV report was validated at the same time as the extension of the CSP at the end of 2017, an evaluation of the implementation of the recommendations would be easier after the conception of the new CSP planned for this year."
Looking forward

In 2017, IDEV will reflect on its experience and challenges to further pursue excellence. IDEV revised its three-year work program to better align to the High 5s and respond to the ongoing transformation in the Bank. It expects to deliver approximately 12 influential evaluations in 2017: five country and regional strategy evaluations, two sector evaluations (energy and water) with related project cluster evaluations, two thematic evaluations (public-private partnerships and agricultural value chains), a corporate evaluation (HR management and strategic directions), and the CBFF evaluation (See Annex 1).

Despite the challenging availability of data in the region, IDEV will strive to collect credible data on development results. It will also pursue its effort to support stronger self-evaluation in the Bank. IDEV is planning to validate 100% of the project completion reports and extended supervision reports prepared by operations departments in 2017. Together with the evaluations of the quality of supervision and the quality at entry of public sector operations, this will inform the broader evaluation of the self-evaluation systems and processes of the Bank.

IDEV will also review the independent evaluation strategy 2013-2017. As an evaluation department, IDEV must review the progress of its current strategy before embarking on the development of a new strategy; this is crucial to its credibility. IDEV will review its 2013-17 strategy identifying where it has and has not made progress. The findings will be used to inform IDEV’s future strategic directions.

As in the past, IDEV will remain nimble and focus even more on its efficiency and effectiveness. In pushing for quality while maintaining quantity, IDEV will finalize its evaluation manual, which will include evaluation standards, processes and tools.

Jean-Luc Dawoulé Bohoussou, NGO MESAD, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire. Evaluation Week Photo contest winner
Thank you

2016 was a singularly productive year for IDEV. We are grateful to all those individuals and organizations that have supported our efforts during this year, including the AfDB Board of Directors, Management and staff, stakeholders of Bank interventions in RMCs, Bank partners and the evaluation community. You helped us to shape and implement our work program and to deliver on our goals of providing a basis for accountability, contributing to enhanced learning and promoting an evaluation culture.

We are thankful to the Bank Board of Directors, which oversees and endlessly supports the work that we do, and to colleagues at the AfDB with whom we have interacted throughout the year. A big thank you goes to IDEV staff, colleagues, and partners for making 2016 such a remarkable year.

*We could not have done this without you.*
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## Annex 1: Evaluations 2012-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Evaluation of Environmental Mainstreaming at AfDB: Support to the Roads Transport Subsector</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fostering Regional Integration in Africa: An Evaluation of the Bank's Multinational Operations</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Evaluation of Public Financial Management Reform</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Bank Assistance to Fragile States</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstreaming Gender Equality: A Road to Results or a Road to Nowhere?</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Institutional Support Projects in the Governance Sector</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the African Development Bank's Economic and Sector Work</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust Fund Management at the AFDB</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Evaluation of Non-Sovereign Operations</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the Bank's Integrated Water Resource Management</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the Bank Procurement – Phase 1</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya Country Strategy Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport Sector Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chad Country Strategy Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Botswana Country Strategy Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madagascar Country Strategy Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Evaluation of MDB Support to Climate Investment Funds</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Bank Support to Microfinance</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Bank Procurement – Phase 2</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality at Entry for CSPs/RISPs</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Cameroon Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Togo Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senegal Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the Bank's Private Equity Investments</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the Bank's Support to SMEs</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the Bank Participation in PPPs – Phase 1</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of GCI VI and ADF 12 and 13 Commitments</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Policy and Strategy Making and Implementation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the Bank’s Budget Management</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster evaluation power interconnection projects</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation – Rural Water Supply and Sanitation in Ethiopia</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact Evaluation – Rural Water Supply and Sanitation in Tanzania</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunisia Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morocco Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burundi Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa Country Strategy and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Integration Strategy Paper Evaluation Eastern Africa</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Sector Development Synthesis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique Country Program Case Study</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEDR Synthesis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2017 | **Evaluations to be delivered**  
Nigeria Country Strategy and Program Evaluation  
Cluster Evaluation rural electrification projects  
Evaluation of the Bank’s support to the Energy Sector  
Congo Basin Forest Fund Evaluation  
Regional Integration Strategy Evaluation Central Africa  
Côte d’Ivoire Country Strategy and Program Evaluation  
Malawi Country Strategy and Program Evaluation  
Comparative Study of Board Efficiency and Effectiveness  
Evaluation of Bank Support to the Water and Sanitation Sector  
Evaluation of Bank participation in PPPs – Phase 2  
Evaluation of Bank Support to agricultural value chains  
Evaluation of the HR management and strategic directions |
|      | **Evaluations to be started**  
Cape Verde Country Strategy and Program Evaluation  
Mauritius Country Strategy and Program Evaluation  
Swaziland Country Strategy and Program Evaluation  
Botswana Mid-Term Evaluation (Pilot)  
Bank Partnerships: Co-financing, Syndication, and Coordination  
Bank Lines of Credit (evaluation synthesis)  
Policy Based Operations  
Bank’s Self Evaluation Systems and Processes  
Quality of Supervision  
Integrated Safeguards and Processes  
Impact Evaluation – Irrigation  
Quality at Entry of Public Sector Operations  
Comparative Study of Sanctions Systems |
1. Comprehensive Evaluation of the Development Results of the AfDB

What did IDEV evaluate?

The Comprehensive Evaluation of the Development Results (CEDR) of the African Development Bank Group (AfDB, or Bank) aims to provide an independent, credible, evidence-based assessment of development results between 2004 and 2013 by answering three questions: (1) Has the Bank achieved its objectives? (2) Has the Bank proposed results-focused strategies and programs? (3) Has the Bank emerged as a valued partner at country level? As well as contributing to accountability, it identifies lessons and makes recommendations to inform the implementation of the Bank’s new strategic priorities, the High 5s.

The scope of the evaluation is all Bank interventions (lending and non-lending) that were approved between 2004 and 2013. The CEDR is based on evaluation studies carried out on a sample of 14 countries: Burundi, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, and Zambia. The 14 countries represent almost UA 17 billion or 60% of the Bank’s lending portfolio based on approvals during 2004-2013. For each...
of these countries, strategies and programs were examined, and all projects that were completed or near completion (169 in total) were reviewed.

**What did IDEV find?**

The evaluation finds that the Bank delivered development results although not to its full potential. **Relevance was rated moderately satisfactory.** Just over half of the country strategies and programs (57%) were found to include interventions that were precisely defined in line with country and beneficiary needs. The Bank was able to reach stronger alignment with country needs when it mobilized interests across diverse stakeholders and was able to adapt by coming up with responsive actions to address identified constraints to achieving results in the country.

**Effectiveness was rated moderately unsatisfactory.** Only close to 30% of Bank interventions examined had achieved or were likely to achieve their intended outcomes. The same proportion was assessed as likely to achieve less than half of planned outcomes. On the upside, more than half of the projects were assessed as likely by design to lead to positive benefits for targeted groups (men, women, youth, and girls), showing that the Bank can make a difference in people’s lives.

**Sustainability was rated moderately unsatisfactory.** Less than a third of the projects reviewed had economic and financial mechanisms sufficiently robust to maintain the outputs and outcomes beyond the lifetime of the project. Less than half the projects were found to have technically sound design and only about 40% of the projects attended to strengthening institutional capacity.

**Efficiency of the Bank in delivering its support was rated moderately unsatisfactory.** Close to half the projects assessed took more than the target 12 months from approval to first disbursement of funds. Nearly one-third of the projects took more than 25% more time to implement than initially planned. Project delays were associated with weak project design, lengthy Bank procedures, and complicated arrangements with other development partners.

**Did the Bank propose results-focused strategies and programs?**

The ambitious reform agenda on which the Bank has embarked to transform itself into a results-oriented learning institution has set it in the right direction. Selectivity and the capacity to propose proper responses to country needs improved over time although some country strategies failed to select sector-specific objectives focusing the Bank’s efforts in its areas of comparative advantage. Furthermore, strategic selectivity did not always translate into a selective portfolio of projects. The quality of project-level intervention logic improved over time although some country strategies failed to select sector-specific objectives focusing the Bank’s efforts in its areas of comparative advantage. Leverage of projects was more ad-hoc than driven by strategic goals set forth in country strategies. The focus was on co-financing rather than on actively mobilizing additional resources.

**Did the Bank emerge as a valued partner at country level?**

While the Bank had strong relationships with its clients and development partners, these relationships were not fully backed by the relevant capacity for broadly positioning it as an influential advisor for policy making and more than a financial provider. Economic and sector work and technical assistance were not fully leveraged to respond to country needs. It was only in fragile situations that the Bank was able to use its brand and relationships to engage in influential policy dialogue. Though most strategies mentioned coordination with other partners, this did not always translate into an alignment of priorities and cooperation at the operational level. Here again, building on long-standing relationships with government, the Bank played a positive role in fragility and emergency contexts. Leveraging in projects was more ad-hoc than driven by strategic goals set forth in country strategies. The focus was on co-financing rather than on actively mobilizing additional resources.

**What were the contextual and internal drivers of Bank performance?**

The Bank’s performance was influenced by country conditions: Interventions were more effective and more sustainable when leadership, ownership, and national capacity to implement existed. Where there were pre-existing frameworks for country dialogue, the Bank engaged in coordinated partnerships and initiatives to leverage
more development resources. When country conditions were less favorable, however, the Bank was unable to analyze contextual constraints and adapt its interventions to make them relevant, effective, and sustainable. Having a country office was advantageous but not sufficient for the Bank to effectively perform its various roles. Capacity constraints and risk-averse behavior at country level were found to limit the effectiveness of the Bank’s presence. Task management and supervision of operations from headquarters did not aid contextual learning. Furthermore, the low flexibility of corporate procedures limited usefulness. The quality of design and effective supervision proved to be the most important yet most limiting factors in country portfolio performance. The Bank clearly recognized the importance of these two factors and initiated multiple reforms related to them, albeit not exclusively.

What did IDEV recommend to the Bank?

The evaluation makes the following recommendations to the Bank as it implements its new strategic priorities. Where actions are already ongoing in the Bank, the recommendations aim to feed lessons into the process and help identify key priority issues to tackle.

Positioning in context

» The Bank needs to analyze and clarify the strategic roles (project financier, knowledge broker, and advisor) that it wishes to play, and actively review and pursue partnership opportunities, as relevant to the country context.

» The Bank should deepen its understanding of constraints to implementation and sustainability. Together with clarity about roles and possible partnerships, this should form the basis for framing strategies, programs, and projects around key selected outcomes.

» The Bank should ensure its country presence as it allows for implementing its strategy. It should review the terms of reference of country offices and make sure they have adequate skills and resources.

Improving corporate services

» The Bank should clarify its impact pathways by ensuring that corporate strategies are based on a well-designed theory of change that is shared with stakeholders and partners.

» The Bank needs to enhance the flexibility of corporate procedures to allow nimble responses to country-specific needs and context.

» The Bank should strengthen its offering of Economic and Sector Work. Whenever it can fill knowledge gaps in specific niches related to its strategies, the Bank should be in a position to propose a relevant combination of analytical work, dialogue and financing instruments to the client country.

Enhancing delivery

» The Bank needs to strengthen its performance and accountability frameworks, processes, and culture, and align incentives to deliver results.

» The Bank should give closer attention to the depth and quality of supervision for private sector operations and strengthen the implementation of supervision for public sector operations.

How did Management respond?

The evaluation provides a sober assessment of the Bank’s performance between 2004 and 2013. And while Management does not always share IDEV’s conclusions, it broadly subscribes to the recommendations that it makes. To this effect, management launched a range of initiatives since 2009 aimed at addressing the challenges raised by the evaluation. These initiatives received additional impetus in April 2016 when the Board adopted the new DBDM to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of Bank actions. IDEV’s evaluation is particularly valuable as the Bank rolls out these new reforms.

2. Burundi Country Strategy and Program Evaluation

What did IDEV evaluate?

The evaluation covered the 2004–2015 period, during which the volume of Bank assistance to Burundi was about UA 544 million (USD 745 million). Of this, UA 237.6 million was for 31 national operations and the rest for multinational projects involving the country. Two priority sectors represented 64% of the Bank’s commitments in the country: transport infrastructure (48%) and economic governance (16%). The other sectors were energy, social, agriculture, and to a lesser extent, the environment, water and sanitation, and communications. A total of 15 completed projects were assessed representing 32% (UA 156.6 million) of the total budget of operations in Burundi. The main funding instruments were the ADF (58%) and the Fragile States Facility (42%).

What did IDEV find?

Relevance is rated satisfactory. Overall, Bank strategies and operations in Burundi are consistent with its overall priorities and strategies. The factors of Burundi’s fragility (political, economic, social and environmental) are well identified in the Bank’s strategies. Bank operations targeted structural fragility factors and resilience building: (i) human and institutional capacity; (ii) underemployment; (iii) equitable access to services, resources and growth, and (iv) the environment.

The effectiveness of Bank operations is moderately satisfactory. The Bank’s operations aided growth factors like mobility and access to electricity, and reduced fragility factors by building governance capacity and promoting employment. However, their impacts on economic growth and poverty reduction remained limited due to severe internal and external constraints.

The sustainability of Bank operations is moderately satisfactory for economic and social infrastructure projects. Technical soundness and national capacity are factors of sustainability in regard to infrastructure. Sustainability is fragile for governance support operations due to lack of ownership of reforms by the government and to a fragile macroeconomic, political and institutional environment. The current political instability poses a serious threat to the viability of all investments.

Bank efficiency is moderately satisfactory in the governance and social sectors and moderately unsatisfactory in the economic infrastructure sector. Project implementation delays are still a major problem, partly due to poor quality at entry
assessment of operations and the weak technical capacity of project implementers. However, the opening of the Bank Country Office has had a positive effect.

**What did IDEV recommend for the new strategy?**

The next country strategy should:

- More explicitly include regional integration and inclusive growth objectives in the strategy, and ensure that they are reflected in the portfolio of operations and mainstreamed into national policies.

- Better mainstream environmental issues into strategies and operations in the context of infrastructure and agricultural projects, clearly gearing them towards the inclusion and strengthening of factors of resilience to climate change.

- Continue to carry out analytical work to inform the formulation and implementation of policies and strategies by focusing on issues relating to inclusive growth, gender, vulnerability and the development of economic activities in order to promote the development of integrated markets within EAC.

- Play a key, more active role in reviving dialogue on governance and public finance management as well as private sector development issues.

- Continue to implement budget support operations while ensuring the economic and financial viability of the investments made and the policies implemented by the Government, and coordinating (in particular) the investment projects financed with internal and external resources.

- Support the establishment of a system to monitor and evaluate strategies and programs implemented in the country.

**How did Management respond?**

Management overall supports the findings of this report, that will be taken into account, along with the recommendations in the proposed extension of the strategy 2012-2016 to 2017, in the design of the next Bank assistance strategy and various operations in Burundi.


What did IDEV evaluate?
The evaluation covered the 2004-2015 period, during which time the volume of Bank assistance to Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) was about UA 1.2 billion for 63 projects. The ADF accounted for 91.7% of the budget committed over the period. The sectors dominating Bank operations during the period were transport (26.2%), energy (22.7%) and water and sanitation (17.7%).

What did IDEV find?

Relevance is moderately satisfactory. The Bank’s strategies in DRC are aligned to its general strategies and have supported the country through its evolution from a “post-conflict” situation to a “development” situation. However, they do not sufficiently deal with all the country’s factors of fragility, thus weakening the overall relevance of the portfolio of operations.

The effectiveness of Bank operations is moderately satisfactory. They are the most effective in the transport and social development sectors. However, results are less convincing in the agricultural and rural development sectors. Operations in the energy, environment, and industry/mining/quarrying sectors are not sufficiently advanced for them to be deemed effective. In economic and financial governance, only one of the four Bank-funded projects, the Emergency Program to Mitigate the Impact of the Financial Crisis (PUAICF), was evaluated as the others were not yet fully implemented. This program helped to restore macroeconomic balance in DRC and to create favorable conditions for implementing the Bank’s subsequent support to public finance management.

The sustainability of Bank operations is deemed to be moderately unlikely. The economic and financial viability of the achievements funded by the Bank is particularly low, mainly because of dysfunctions in the concerned sector policies and the absence of “post-project” support strategies.

Bank efficiency is noted to be moderately satisfactory. Project implementation delays are a major
Annexes | 53

problem. The opening of the Bank’s country office in 2007 helped improve the portfolio disbursement rate but country context, government procedures, and Bank internal procedures contributed to delays.

There is a wide gap between the Bank’s professed intentions in DRC as concerns policy dialogue and its results. Apart from economic governance, where the Bank significantly engaged in policy dialogue that resulted in positive outcomes, in other sectors, the Bank’s involvement in dialogue on sector policy implementation was limited to the production of studies that were insufficiently promoted. Furthermore, the Bank’s involvement in dialogue with civil society stakeholders and the private sector remains weak.

What did IDEV recommend for the new strategy?

The evaluation proposes four recommendations as follows:

» Focus the Bank’s intervention strategy in DRC increasingly on areas of comparative advantage that makes it possible to act more significantly on factors of fragility.

» Improve quality at entry for Bank operations in DRC.

» Improve the sustainability of operations through coordinated efforts in strategy formulation, preparation of operations, and policy dialogue.

» Improve the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms of the Bank’s cooperation strategy and operations in DRC.

How did Management respond?

Management welcomes the recommendations which will contribute to strengthen the efficiency of the Bank’s assistance in the country and strengthen the quality of the next Bank strategy in DRC.


What did IDEV evaluate?

The evaluation covered the 2002-2015 period during which time the volume of Bank assistance to Ghana was about UA 1.3301 billion for 44 projects. Nearly 78% of Bank financing during this period came through the ADF window; the ADB window accounted for about 19%. Loans represent 82% of the portfolio and grants represent 18%. The majority of Bank support by value was in the transport, governance and agriculture sectors (32.2%, 24.3% and 14.3% respectively).

What did IDEV find?

Relevance of the Bank’s CSPs and project portfolio was satisfactory. Over the evaluation period, they were found to be well aligned with contemporary national development strategies. Furthermore, the project portfolio is aligned with the Bank’s CSPs, corporate and sector policies and the needs of beneficiaries.

Effectiveness of the Bank’s interventions was found moderately satisfactory. Across sectors, 88% of planned outputs were delivered and in several cases, targets for delivery of outputs were exceeded. Transport sector projects reduced travel times and costs, and aided economic activities. Governance sector projects helped improve regulations for the private sector, but modest progress was seen with respect to decentralization, strengthening of accountability functions and control of public sector wage expenditure. Agricultural sector projects significantly improved productivity and increased incomes. Successes were also noted in the power, finance and industry, and water supply and sanitation sectors.

Efficiency was rated as unsatisfactory. Long delays, averaging 18 months, were noted between approvals and first disbursements. In addition, there were long implementation delays.

Sustainability is moderately unlikely overall. Interventions in nearly all sectors (power, transport,
governance, agriculture, social and water) are beset by risks to sustainability, including lack of maintenance funds, low institutional capacity and lack of ownership.

**What did IDEV recommend for the new strategy?**

The Bank should:

» Propose a mix of instruments to further support private sector regulatory reform, improve the business environment and strengthen accountability functions, particularly audit and procurement.

» Identify opportunities to engage the private sector in addressing a broader range of CSP objectives.

» Encourage private investment in the energy sector by promoting cost-reflective tariffs and providing guarantees for power purchase agreements.

» Improve support to regional trade, by continuing to address infrastructure constraints while also incorporating trade facilitation considerations.

» Address weaknesses in project design which impact both effectiveness and sustainability through enhanced scrutiny prior to approval, including: (i) the extent of consultation with project beneficiaries; (ii) quality of feasibility studies; (iii) project implementation capacity; (iv) realism of project scope and timeframes; (v) mitigation of risks to sustainability; and (vi) clear arrangements for the collection of implementation data.

» Address obstacles to timely implementation by limiting requirements for counterpart funds and ensuring that all stakeholders are made aware of conditions precedent.

» Ensure that crosscutting themes are included in project log-frames and disaggregated at the outcome level.

» Further strengthen supervision by ensuring that all elements of the project logic are addressed or that credible alternatives are identified, and improving the skills mix of supervision teams for private sector operations.

**How did Management respond?**

Management agrees with the key findings and recommendations of the evaluation. The various findings and recommendations will be taken into account in developing the Bank’s country strategy paper (2017-2021) and the various resulting operations in Ghana.

What did IDEV evaluate?

The evaluation covered the 2004–2014 period during which the volume of Bank assistance to Morocco was about UA 3.8 billion (USD 5.2 billion) for 58 projects. Energy and transport infrastructure together represented 48% of the Bank’s net commitments in Morocco. The evaluation assessed 21 of 33 completed projects. Resources used by the Bank in Morocco were mostly from the ADB window (94.2%).

What did IDEV find?

Relevance is considered satisfactory. The Bank programs and strategies are consistent with Morocco’s sectoral and crosscutting strategies. These programs, led in partnership with the government and financial and technical partners, implicitly took into consideration issues such as gender and the degree of inclusion of disadvantaged people. They did so by helping to reduce social and regional inequalities, particularly in access to public services, and impacts on the environment and climate change. However, the social and spatial inclusion impacts, taken into account in the 2012 Economic and Financial Governance Support Program, remain fragile.

Effectiveness is moderately satisfactory. In terms of effectiveness, the Bank’s assistance contributed to the significant changes observed between 2004 and 2014, mainly in terms of contribution to the reduction of poverty as well as social and regional disparities. Interventions in the health, education and vocational training sectors led to clear improvements: child mortality dropped to 26.1/1000 in 2014 from 36.5 in 2004, and school and vocational training enrolment increased. Bank assistance to the transport sector led to great progress in terms of liberalization, development of competition and improvement of the quality of service of the different transport modes. In the energy sector, an integrated project financed by the Bank raised the rural electrification rate to 99% by the end of July 2015. In the agricultural sector, Bank operations contributed to an increase in agricultural GDP from 3.98% (average over 2000-2009) to 7.6% in 2014.

Sustainability is moderately satisfactory. While the results of the reforms carried out by the strongly-committed Government of Morocco are sustainable for the most part, some outputs still need attention. Bank-financed projects in the productive and infrastructure sectors are generally viable. A potential risk to sustainability is the lack of clarity of institutional and regulatory frameworks for sectors such as water and sanitation, transport and
especially energy. These did not have regulatory bodies to oversee the relationships among private sector actors, central government, and users.

**The efficiency of Bank strategies and programs is deemed moderately satisfactory.** While budget support was usually disbursed on time, delays were noted mostly in technical assistance operations with slippage ranging from 2-36 months.

**What did IDEV recommend for the new strategy?**

» Continue to support the Moroccan Government in its macroeconomic, financial and economic diversification efforts to ensure inclusive equitable and sustainable growth.

» Support the Government in its transition to green growth and agricultural sector development.

» Anchor the identification of economic and sector work in the CSP preparation process (preparation, mid-term review and completion) to enhance its relevance and strategic alignment, improve the predictability of its financing and ensure its continuing use for policy dialogue purposes.

» Implement a capacity building program for sector executing agencies, support the development and establishment of results-based monitoring and evaluation systems and scale up the use of existing national systems as part of technical assistance and grant operations financing.

» Capitalize on the existing synergy between the Bank’s public and private sector windows to affirm its positioning and consider the possibility of adding a private sector specialist to the Bank’s Morocco country office’s human resources in order to consolidate its comparative advantage as an ‘integrated Bank’.

**How did Management respond?**

On the whole, Management agrees with the findings of this report and, in particular, that the Bank has made significant contributions to Morocco’s economic growth and public sector performance. The various findings and recommendations will be taken into account in developing the Bank’s new assistance strategy for Morocco (2017-2021) and the various resulting operations.


What did IDEV evaluate?

IDEV evaluated more than a decade of engagement and support from the Bank in South Africa (2004-2015). In total, the approved portfolio exceeds 3 billion UA, making it one of the Bank’s largest clients. The portfolio combines both public and private sector financing, and is grouped around two main poles – infrastructure (especially energy) and finance (especially lines of credit).

What did IDEV find?

Overall, the evaluation found a Bank that is learning to adapt to the developed, competitive South African market. If the Bank wants to remain relevant and grow its portfolio in South Africa, it will need to refine its processes and provide a more tailored approach. Specifically, the evaluation highlighted:

» The need for the Bank to invest in identifying its comparative advantage or niche in South Africa. The Bank seeks to be more than a financier in providing support yet it has not organized or resourced itself to make this a reality. Strategic objectives and the planned portfolio were based on an inadequate understanding of where Bank instruments would be considered competitive by South African clients.

» Some projects in the finance sector were successful in commercial banking terms but not necessarily designed, implemented and monitored to ensure the best results from a development banking perspective – in terms of understanding results in areas like job creation, and small and medium enterprise development.

» Bank decentralization has been insufficient. It has left gaps in capacity in vital areas, affecting business development and efficiency. Looking forward, the implementation of the Bank’s new business delivery model can benefit the South Africa program especially if it addresses bottlenecks in capacity such as business development, disbursement, legal, operations assistance, and (if these remain central to the next strategy) the resources to work on knowledge and capacity.

Relevance is moderately satisfactory. The evaluation found the focus and objectives of the program, strategies and the individual projects, to be broadly relevant and well aligned with the priorities of the Bank and of the Government of South Africa. However, this high degree of relevance in what the Bank was seeking to achieve was not always reflected in the design of the pipeline of operations or individual projects in terms of their appropriateness, quality, and appraisal.
Efficiency is moderately unsatisfactory. Time efficiency was highlighted as a concern across the portfolio. Major delays occurred at various stages of the project process from appraisal through implementation and affecting both large and small projects. The factors affecting timeliness were recurrent: long, bureaucratic processes and under-sourcing of task managers and of relevant support department staff. The Bank is not perceived to be the nimble partner that public and private South African institutions want.

Effectiveness is moderately unsatisfactory. The levels of achievement – at output and outcome level – varied by sector. In infrastructure, output delivery was generally solid albeit often late. In the energy sector, for example, project delays, among other things, thwarted the expected increase in power generation to prevent load shedding, but projects are on track to deliver the expected level of power at a later date. In the finance sector there was considerable variation in project outcomes. Some less well performing projects had inappropriate indicators while others missed the strategy’s focus of developing South African small and medium enterprises. With regard to knowledge work and capacity development, high ambitions were not tethered to a solid analysis of the Bank’s comparative advantage, to the existence of appropriate tools or to the necessary expertise or resources.

Sustainability is moderately satisfactory. Sustainability was considered from a financial, technical, environmental, and social perspective. On the infrastructure side, technical and financial sustainability were strong, with environmental concerns raised for the ongoing coal power station. For the finance projects, in terms of ongoing profitability, the Bank itself took on little financial risk, as it used intermediaries. The Bank had not ensured that enough data was available to reliably assess the environmental and social sustainability of line of credit sub-projects, though indications were that most of the intermediaries had strengthened their own environmental and social requirements.

What did IDEV recommend for the new strategy?

Based on the findings and conclusions, the evaluation made recommendations in the following six areas:

1. Conducting a more detailed analysis of the Bank’s comparative advantage and constraints and the resources required to deliver against specific objectives to inform the next CSP.

2. Addressing the mismatch between the implicit and explicit objectives of lines of credit and between project appraisal reports and loan agreements.

3. Revising the Bank’s approach to private sector operation design and monitoring.

4. Using the South Africa experience to identify new flexible funding mechanisms suited for middle-income countries.

5. Ensuring a complete decentralization process and business process streamlining.

6. Using its continental mandate to help to share the lessons from South Africa’s experience in the energy sector, with other RMCs.

How did Management respond?

Bank Management agreed with the main findings, and committed to use the recommendations to inform the next CSP 2018-2022.

What did IDEV evaluate?

The evaluation examines the African Development Bank’s assistance to Tunisia over the 2004-2015 period. Between 2004 and 2015, the Bank financed 58 projects in Tunisia amounting to about UA 2.38 billion (USD 3.4 billion). 22 operations representing about 61.9% of net commitments in Tunisia over the period have been completed or closed. This evaluation assessed 13 of the completed projects. The Bank intervened in 9 sectors, with particular emphasis on transport infrastructure and governance, which alone represented 72% of its net commitments in Tunisia. The resources used by the Bank mainly came from the ADB window (97.5% for 24 projects). Other resources were from the Middle-Income Countries Trust Fund and two Trust Funds created after the Arab Spring – the Transition Support Fund and the Multi-Donor Trust Fund for Middle East and North African Countries.

What did IDEV find?

Relevance is satisfactory. From both a strategic and operational standpoint, the Bank satisfactorily aligned its different interventions to meet Tunisia’s development needs and priorities while appropriately combining the instruments offered by the public and private sector windows in the different economic sectors. However, the relevance of project design varies according to sector and period (pre- and post-revolution).

Effectiveness of Bank operations in Tunisia is rated as moderately satisfactorily. In the areas of governance, improvement of the macroeconomic framework and competitiveness, significant improvements had been made before 2011. The Bank’s contributions to the road transport sector, energy sector, infrastructure development, water and sanitation sector, and the agricultural sector before 2011 are also tangible. Expected results in the air transport sector were however not achieved. Inter-regional disparities remain in terms of quality of health services, access to water and sanitation, roads and energy.

Sustainability is moderately unsatisfactory. The sustainability of the outcomes of reforms implemented by the authorities is likely to be compromised by the lack of ownership observed since 2011. The country’s socio-political context and weak institutional capacity raise doubts about the sustainability of the results achieved in its macroeconomic framework and competitiveness. Budget allocations are not sufficient to ensure routine infrastructure maintenance.
Efficiency is deemed moderately satisfactory. Despite sound financial performance evaluated by the economic and financial rates of return, delays were noted in the implementation of most projects after 2011. The observed delays arose from the slow approval of works contracts, an over-restrictive regulatory framework and general disorder after the revolution.

What did IDEV recommend for the new strategy?

» Engage in dialogue with the Government in order to initiate a large-scale reform process that will affect all aspects of the economic recovery within the framework of an integrated national plan.

» Improve mainstreaming of inclusion aspects in the Bank’s strategies and operations through closer targeting of adequate measures aimed at ensuring sustainable outcomes. The Bank should continue to support the Government in its administrative regionalization and decentralization efforts, including mechanisms for the establishment of contractual relationships with the regions and regional communities in order to pursue its commitment to inclusive and equitable growth.

» Prepare and implement a capacity building program for the central government, executing agencies and regional authorities.

» Support the Government in completing the reforms in the finance and insurance sectors in order to strengthen financial intermediation and inclusion in Tunisia.

» Conduct a comprehensive analysis of the Bank’s experience in the agricultural sector in Tunisia and draw lessons from the Bank’s experiences in other countries (for example, Nigeria and Morocco) with a view to exploring alternative approaches (for example, value chain approaches) in the context of AfDB’s new 2016-2025 agricultural transformation strategy.

How did Management respond?

Management agrees overall with the findings of the report. The various conclusions and recommendations will be taken into account in preparing the Bank’s new assistance strategy for Tunisia for the 2017-2021 period and in the various ensuing operations.


What did IDEV evaluate?

The evaluation covered the 2002-2015 period during which time the volume of Bank assistance to Zambia was about UA 947.84 million for 43 operations. The majority of the Bank’s support by value was to the transport, power, water supply and sanitation, and agriculture sectors (31.7%, 19.3%, 14.3% and 10.9% respectively). Bank financing over the evaluation period was mainly through the ADF window (about 45%), closely followed by the ADB window at 43%.

What did IDEV find?

Effectiveness was assessed as moderately unsatisfactory. Achievement of outputs for completed projects across each sector was fairly satisfactory, with 78% of outputs delivered successfully. But achievement of project outcomes fell below expectations. Whereas at the strategy level, the Bank’s interventions have made a tangible contribution to the development of an enabling business environment and increasing access to basic infrastructure and services, limited progress has been achieved in strengthening public financial management and promoting agricultural productivity and diversity.

Sustainability was rated moderately unsatisfactory, with variability across sectors arising from financial, institutional capacity, technical unsustainability issues.

The efficiency of the Bank’s portfolio is rated as unsatisfactory. This is due to considerable project implementation delays and portfolio disbursement ratios, which consistently fell below the Bank-wide average over the evaluation period. Economic Rate-of-Return for the Bank’s projects was not rated due to the unavailability of adequate data.

Relevance was assessed as satisfactory. Bank strategies were well aligned with the priorities set in the Government of the Republic of Zambia’s national development plans over the evaluation period and have responded to changes in these priorities over time. The Bank’s project portfolio has generally been aligned with country strategies over the period as well as with the needs of targeted beneficiaries.
**What did IDEV recommend for the new strategy?**

The evaluation proposes the following nine recommendations to the Bank:

1. Continue to support private sector regulatory reform and build capacity among the accountability functions of government, particularly audit and procurement.

2. Strengthen the Bank’s role in donor coordination, analytical work and policy dialogue.

3. Address constraints to private sector involvement in service delivery and address infrastructure bottlenecks.

4. Identify opportunities to scale up development outcomes from private sector investments.

5. Deepen the integration of gender in the Bank’s operations and engage in policy dialogue on gender with the government in collaboration with development partners.

6. Promote synergies within the Bank program and in coordination with other donors between projects that improve the productivity of small businesses and increase access to finance.

7. Identify means of harmonizing project implementation approaches with other co-financing partners as well as within projects that possess both private and public sector components.


9. Identify and mitigate operational issues surrounding multinational projects aimed at regional integration.

**How did Management respond?**

Management welcomes the IDEV Evaluation of the African Development Bank’s Country Strategy and Program for Zambia (2002-2015). The purpose of the Evaluation was to assess, among others, the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the strategic interventions and to inform the preparation of the next Zambia Country Strategy. The evaluation revealed that the Bank’s Country Strategies were relevant in terms of strategic focus and alignment in addressing Zambia’s Development challenges. The projects supported by the Bank delivered most of the planned outputs while project outcomes did not always meet the targets. Project efficiency was rated moderately unsatisfactory largely due to the lags in preparing projects and the delays between loan approval and effectiveness for first disbursement. Sustainability was rated moderately unsatisfactory. This was due to low profitability of some private sector projects while issues of cost reflective pricing was lacking in water and energy supported projects.

9. Mozambique Country Program Case Study

What did IDEV do?

IDEV carried out an evaluative case study of the Bank’s strategy and program in Mozambique over the period 2004-2013. During the review period, the Bank approved UA 673.98 million for 30 projects. The majority of projects were funded through the African Development Fund (92.82%). A case study, undertaken with the primary purpose to inform the CEDR, sought to identify specific factors affecting the Bank’s performance in Mozambique.

Key lessons for the implementation of the future strategy

Overall, the Bank interventions generated positive results in Mozambique’s economic development in the public sector, financial sector, judicial system, infrastructure and social sectors. However some factors have hampered the performance and project results achievement. The case study identified specific factors affecting the Bank’s performance in Mozambique that are both internal and external to the Bank.

The positive internal factors identified are:

» The existence of a country office: The opening of the Bank’s office in Mozambique has played a critical role in improving Bank performance in the country through improved supervision, donor coordination and project effectiveness.

» Partnerships: In Mozambique, the Bank benefitted from a well-organized partnership landscape, that is, the G19 group of donors.
The limiting internal factors identified, requiring attention from the Bank, are:

» Low selectivity.

» Weak project design, limited anticipation and management of constraints and risks.

» Rigid procedures.

The main contextual positive factor identified was:

Country ownership. The government of Mozambique demonstrated strong ownership in its cooperation with AfDB.

The main contextual limiting factors identified were:

» Readiness to reform. The procedures to approve certain reforms are extremely complex in Mozambique and can take more than a year.

» The Portuguese language was not factored into the projects as a risk.

» Lack of capacity of executing agencies: Executing agencies do not always have the capacity to execute the project activities or manage the resources.

» Pre-conditions for project implementation: It is sometimes a challenge for the government to meet the prerequisites for loan disbursement.

10. Evaluation of Bank’s Eastern Africa Regional Integration Strategy Paper

What did IDEV evaluate?

The evaluation assesses the Eastern Africa Regional Integration Strategy Paper (RISP) for the period 2011-2015. It examines all 24 of the Bank’s operations approved during the evaluation period under the RISP and amounting to UA 1,412 million. The development sectors covered under the Eastern Africa RISP include transport, energy, finance, ICT, agriculture, and multi-sector.

What did IDEV find?

The Eastern Africa RISP’s relevance is moderately satisfactory. Indeed, it is aligned with the Bank’s strategic objectives under the Ten-Year Strategy and the projects funded under the strategy constitute a priority for participating RMCs. However, the evaluation found that about 30% of multi-country or single country operations do not directly contribute to the objective of regional integration, even if all of them were supportive of the RISP’s other objectives and those of the Bank.

The RISP’s overall effectiveness is rated moderately satisfactory. Good progress was noted despite the discrepancy between the RISP’s two pillars as far as results in achieving the planned outputs and outcomes are concerned. The Regional Infrastructure Pillar of the RISP was found to have greater demonstrated effectiveness than the Capacity Building Pillar. The evaluation concluded that greater attention to policy reform and “soft” infrastructure, particularly at the design stage, would have further advanced the ambitious regional integration outcomes identified in the RISP.

Overall, sustainability is rated as moderately unsatisfactory. Sustainability is weak with variations across sectors. Projects in the financial and transport sectors fared better on sustainability compared to the agriculture sector and institution building operations, where it is weakest.

Efficiency is rated as moderately unsatisfactory. The weak capacity of Regional Economic Communities (RECs)/RMCs revealed serious delays with problems in the procurement process of the capacity building operations. Analyses of costs or rates of return were absent in the majority of the implementation progress reports and supervision reports, making it difficult to conclude whether the operations were on track or would be efficient once implemented.
Coherence. The Bank’s dialogue with RMCs and RECs did deal with regional integration issues in almost all cases. Some of these areas of dialogue include the regional integration dimensions of transport corridor projects, capacity building for road safety, and technical assistance on trade facilitation for the East African Community. However, it was noted that policy dialogue with the private sector, especially in transport corridor projects, was missing in the RISP.

Donor Coordination. In many cases, the Bank assumed a leadership role with regard to donor coordination in the 24 operations reviewed. However, performance was somewhat weaker in terms of working formally within the Paris Declaration framework and fostering greater coordination between RECs and RMCs and between RECs and the Bank. This is partly due to lack of clarity as to who is ultimately in charge.

Managing for Development Results. The Bank’s system for managing for development results is not being implemented robustly enough to help guide implementation or serve as a basis for supervision. Outcomes (and their associated indicators) are well beyond what the project could affect; relevant baselines and target indicators for completion are frequently missing. Too often, project outputs and outcomes do not address the broader regional integration issues and therefore opportunities for synergies are missed.

What did IDEV recommend for the new strategy?

» Improve the procurement process by supporting RECs and/or RMCs

» Design and implement results-based monitoring and evaluation systems so they provide valuable management tools for assessing and managing for results

» Support RECs and/or RMCs to develop solid mechanisms to handle commercial, financial and technical sustainability risks associated with asset management of regional public goods

» Strengthen the institutional capacity of RECs by underscoring their importance as the key building blocks for continental integration

» Consider to underpin the next RISP with a clear vision that focuses on regional integration and that is supported by a theory of change and a results-based framework

How did Management respond?

Management welcomes IDEV’s evaluation of the RISP for Eastern Africa, covering the period 2011 to 2015 (extended by 1 year to 2016). The evaluation provides a timely assessment of the Bank’s contribution to regional integration in Eastern Africa in terms of the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of its interventions in the region. Management generally agrees with the findings of the evaluation and welcomes the recommendations of the IDEV Evaluation, which will be taken into account in the preparation of the Bank’s new RISP 2017-21 for Eastern Africa and the Bank’s RISP guidelines currently under preparation.


What did we evaluate?

This synthesis outlines the key findings of 33 evaluations of support for private sector development (PSD) undertaken by bilateral and multilateral institutions over the past five years. The purpose of the synthesis is to inform the strategic direction, design, and implementation of future PSD initiatives so as to leverage the sector’s role in spurring economic growth and advancing development effectiveness in Africa. The synthesis specifically 1) garners evaluative knowledge on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and management of private sector programs, and 2) teases out key lessons pertaining to what worked, what did not, and why.

What did we find?

Constraints to PSD. There was broad agreement on the main constraints to PSD: inadequate access to electricity, lack of access to finance, corruption, high tax rates, political instability, competition from the informal sector, and inadequate worker and management skills. The importance of these constraints varied by firm size, country context, and donor. Most donors used in-country consultations, and to a lesser extent formal diagnostic tools, as the mechanisms for identifying PSD constraints.

Relevance. While donor strategies are broadly aligned with national PSD strategies, selectivity challenges and unclear underlying rationale (theory of change) in addition to poor diagnostics and beneficiary selection weakened the relevance of PSD interventions.

Effectiveness. The effectiveness of PSD interventions varied depending on the nature of intervention (e.g. economy-wide, sector-specific, or firm-specific) and the instruments (financial and non-financial) employed. The benefits of economy-wide policy reform measures, especially for enhancing the business environment and ensuring the availability of infrastructure, were however unquestioned.

Efficiency. Efficiency varied depending on intervening factors (e.g. in-country donor presence, institutional capacity, level of investment, and use of public sector institutions). Overall, in-country donor presence and PSD support via financial intermediaries resulted in better efficiency.

Sustainability. Sustainability was generally deemed weak, primarily because it was not systematically built into program design. Emphasis was placed more on financial rather than on institutional sustainability.

Design and Delivery. Donor PSD program design was complex due to the choice of constraints
to be addressed, the diversity of instruments and the multiplicity of implementing agencies, leading to implementation, coordination and sequencing challenges. Donors privilege “gap-filling” over additionality, catalytic impact, and minimizing distortions emanating from subsidies but this is not a successful strategy. In the case of providing financing support through intermediaries, the choice of intermediaries – taking into account their capacity and development focus – was an important determinant of success.

**Coordination.** There was little evidence of donor coordination at country level beyond the exchange of information and utilization of standardized financial and private sector intercessors, and participating in global and regional multi-donor programs.

**Monitoring and Evaluation.** A number of weaknesses were flagged in the area of monitoring and evaluation: 1) a difficulty in assessing the impact of programs designed to influence and change private sector behaviors; 2) a focus on outputs rather than outcomes; 3) a lack of baseline data, and 4) challenges of donor attribution.

**Gender Mainstreaming.** Coverage of gender specific issues among the evaluations was surprisingly limited.

**What do we take away?**

» A need to transcend “gap-filling” and move toward an integrated approach that privileges additionality and catalytic impact.

» Invest in research to unpack and understand the poverty impact of the macro, sector, and firm level support in PSD programs.

» Ensure proper capacity assessment of donors, intermediaries, and governments so they effectively deliver on expected outcomes in a sustainable manner.

» Include capacity development components for intermediaries in all donor support packages so as to enhance institutional capacity, while creating an enabling environment for success.

» Design, implement, and invest in a rigorous and integrated monitoring and evaluation system that focuses on outcomes.

12. Impact Evaluation of the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program in Ethiopia

What did IDEV evaluate?

The evaluation covered the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program (RWSSP) implemented in Ethiopia between 2006 and 2014. The RWSSP had a total investment cost of UA 60.2 million, of which 72% from an AfDB ADF grant and 28% from contributions by the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and the beneficiary communities. The evaluation assessed the net effects of the RWSSP on the quality of life of the rural beneficiaries mainly in terms of access to improved water and daily per capita safe water consumption; diarrhea incidence among under-five children; travel time saved in fetching water; children’s school attendance; and women’s productive employment.

What did IDEV find?

The evaluation found that the program was effective in yielding the following desirable impacts:

» Improving household access to and use of improved water sources in the target communities. Household access to and use of improved water sources increased by 69 percentage points. More than 90% of households who fetched water from RWSSP sources expressed satisfaction with the quality of the water.

» Promoting private latrine ownership and use. Household ownership and use of private latrines surged; 66,534 household latrines were reported constructed in addition to 1057 public latrines. This contributed to the decrease in open-defecation.

» Reducing the time for fetching water, and generating positive time-savings: the RWSSP saved 23 minutes for daily water fetching trips per person. This was grossly below the set target of 2 hours, but the time-savings was significant relative to that in non-RWSSP communities.

However, the evaluation revealed that RWSSP was less effective in enhancing the following:
» **Daily per capita water consumption**, as there was no detectable impact and the daily per capita water consumption was already far in excess of the national standard.

» **Hand-washing at critical times**, which was widespread and without soap.

» **Children school enrolment**, which was already in excess of 95% for girls and boys.

» **Women’s participation in self-employment**. The time saved fetching water was overwhelmingly used for domestic activities.

» **Reducing the incidence of diarrhea among under-fives**, as hand-washing practices at critical times among children were apparently limited. However, the RWSSP significantly reduced the incidence of diarrhea among persons of all ages.

» **Sustaining results**. Sustaining the RWSSP results is unlikely because of institutional, technical, financial and development information inadequacies. The program enhanced the community institutional and management capacity, particularly the WaSH committee, but it was not effective in operating, maintaining and sustaining the WaSH facilities and services. Further, the RWSSP facilities and services were not financially and technically viable.

*Establishing an effective monitoring and evaluation system* for supporting implementing the sustainability of results.

**What did IDEV recommend?**

» **Develop a clear strategy** for sustaining the benefits of the RWSSI in collaboration with key stakeholders (including the federal, regional and woreda administrations, and WaSH committees).

» **Support the development and implementation** of an effective monitoring, evaluation and learning system to ensure regular, pertinent data collection, analysis, reporting and feedback, especially on RWSSP community WaSH results.

**How did Management respond?**

Management welcomes IDEV’s Impact Evaluation report on the Bank’s Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program in the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia presenting the positive impact on the communities in the targeted areas. Management acknowledges that the intervention slightly fell short in some aspects of the anticipated impact. The different lessons drawn from this report will inform future strategies, policies and programs of the Bank, to improve the Bank’s operations and learning agenda. Most of these lessons have already been integrated into the newly launched One WaSH National Program in Ethiopia under the leadership of the Government of Ethiopia.


What did IDEV evaluate?

IDEV evaluated the RWSSP implemented in Tanzania between 2006 and 2015 with a total investment cost of UA 423 million, including a 28% contribution from the AfDB and the rest from the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania and other development partners. It assessed its net effects on the quality of life of the rural beneficiaries mainly in terms of access to improved water and daily per capita safe water consumption; diarrhea incidence among under-five children; travel time saved in fetching water; children’s school attendance; and women’s productive employment.

What did IDEV find?

» The RWSSP delivered structures and procedures at local government authority and community levels for the planning, development, and operation of rural water and sanitation but the associated budgets were neither fully in place nor efficiently coordinated due to poor fund management from central to local government.

» Community-Owned water supply organizations (COWSOs) and council water and sanitation teams were trained to be able to globally manage the RWSS, although in some cases, training was uneven.

» The RWSSP made significant progress in installing functional rural water supply systems. By October 2015, it had developed 43,255 water points compared with a target of 31,747. However, delivery of sanitation and hygiene facilities and services, and of coordination between rural water supply and sanitation components, made less significant progress.

» Construction of improved latrines and school water, sanitation and hygiene facilities was noted: 25% of the improved latrines and 16% of the school programs were achieved by June 2014.

» Progress was made in schools, where 66 of the 67 schools surveyed had toilet facilities for pupils that were being used. Only 48% of the 67 schools had a water supply at the toilets for hand washing and 76% had a drinking water facility.

» Program impact was positive but modest on the incidence of diarrheal disease among children under five and the rural population in general.

» About 82 minutes were being saved per round trip from fetching water, which significantly increased women’s participation in economic activities, in particular on productive paid labor and on income-generating activities, by 9.1%,
but had no detectable impact on girls’ enrolment in primary schools, which was already very high.

» The program failed to stimulate the expected significant economic growth in the local water engineering sector across the district towns of Tanzania because most construction work of new water supply schemes by the program was contracted to larger firms based in Dar es Salaam or other major centers.

» RWSSP sustainability encountered obstacles emerging from COWSO’s lack of financial and technical viability, inefficient fund management and poor coordination of water and sanitation interventions, failure to recognize the ongoing need for institutional maintenance at community level, the failure of public-private partnerships to grow as intended in the national policy, and climate change.

What did IDEV recommend?

» Expedite Government’s reforms to public finance management systems that ensure predictable, smooth and timely transfer of domestic and donor funding to local government authorities for the development, operation and maintenance of RWSSPs.

» Ensure that Government undertakes a careful review of affordability issues as they relate to the provision of the National Water Policy for users to pay for improved rural water supplies.

» Ensure that Government replaces the current ad hoc approach to financial support from local government authorities to COWSOs with revisions to the National Water Policy that specify what types of COWSO maintenance and repair cost will be subsidized, and how.

» Ensure that Government increases, within feasible fiscal limits, recurrent funding to council water and sanitation teams.

» Ensure that Government’s policy and procedures for rural water supply and sanitation recognize more explicitly that long-term institutional maintenance is vital for the sustainability of COWSOs and RWSSP benefits.

» Ensure the operational integration, in WSDP Phase II, of the National Sanitation Campaign with programs for the development of rural water supplies, with appropriate arrangements for coordinated management and continuing provision for ring-fencing of sanitation budgets.

» Ensure that the Ministry of Water enhances its current efforts in terms of developing electricity connection, solar technology and field monitoring and data management to improve the rural water sector and everything that is linked to it such as the adoption of sanitation and hygiene practices, and time savings and alternative time uses by women and girls.

» Ensure that Government and its development partners in the rural water and sanitation sector undertake another impact evaluation of RWSSP in five years’ time – long enough for the results and sustainability of these rural and water sanitation initiatives to be clearly visible.

How did Management respond?

Management endorses the findings and recommendations of the evaluation, expanding the evidence on the development impacts of Bank operations in the water and sanitation sector. The evaluation revealed positive impacts on households and communities in the targeted intervention areas. Management also acknowledges that the intervention slightly fell short in some aspects of the anticipated impact. Management welcomes the recommendation to consider exploring the option of conducting longer-term evaluations that can better capture the effects on outcomes. This evaluation will inform future strategies, policies and programs, and improve Bank operations and learning.

Annex 3: Implementation of Management Actions

This annex provides an overview of the status of actions committed to by Bank Management in response to recommendations in IDEV evaluations, as shown in the MARS at 31 December 2016. The process concerns higher-level evaluations containing recommendations and the subject of a management response (this generally excludes synthesis evaluations and country case studies, for example). After an IDEV evaluation has been presented to CODE accompanied by its Management Response, IDEV uploads it with its individual recommendations into the MARS. Bank Management subsequently enters the actions to which it commits in response to each recommendation (in the management action record), and updates the implementation status of the actions quarterly. The evaluation date recorded in the system and reflected in the table below is the date on which the evaluation is distributed to the Board, which is always later than the date on which IDEV considers an evaluation to be “delivered.” In addition, there can be a lag between the distribution date and the CODE presentation date. The table shows the number of evaluations, recommendations and actions recorded in the MARS as at 31 December 2016. At 31 December 2016, Management had not yet entered all actions associated with all evaluations that had been distributed to the Board that year.

### Evaluations by Type, Recommendations, Actions 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Type</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate &amp; Process</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management has undertaken a first round of monitoring of the 34 evaluations, 319 recommendations and 434 actions that were in recorded in MARS in mid-2016.

The graph below shows that 38% of these actions have been completed and 59% are being implemented. 2% of the actions have not seen any progress.

**First Round of Monitoring (2012-2016)**

- **38% of the actions have been completed**
- **59% of the actions are being implemented**
- **2% of the actions have not seen any progress**
Local market in Togo built with support from AfDB